

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 557

October 31, 1995, 2:15 p.m.
Page S-16371 Temp. Record

TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE/Passage

SUBJECT: Conference report to accompany the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996 . . . H.R. 2002. Agreeing to the report.

ACTION: CONFERENCE REPORT AGREED TO, 87-10

SYNOPSIS: The conference report to accompany H.R. 2002, the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996, will appropriate \$12.5 billion in new budget authority (BA) for the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies, and will set the obligational ceiling for the Highway Trust Fund at \$17.5 billion. In total the bill will provide \$37.5 billion in budget authority, trust fund ceilings, and exempt obligations. Details are provided below.

Department of Transportation budget authority, \$12.624 billion, including:

- Federal Aviation Administration, \$6.766 billion;
- Coast Guard, \$3.375 billion;
- Federal Transit Administration, \$1.276 billion; and
- Amtrak grants, \$635 million.

Department of Transportation trust fund ceilings, \$22.054 billion, including:

- Federal Highway Administration trust fund limitation, \$17.638 billion (plus \$2.332 billion in exempt obligations);
- Federal Transit Administration trust fund limitation, \$2.775 billion (\$1.110 billion for formula grants and \$1.665 billion for discretionary grants); and
- Federal Aviation trust fund limitation, \$1.450 billion.

Related agencies:

- National Transportation Safety Board, \$39.1 million; and
- Interstate Commerce Commission: \$13.9 million for termination costs.

Miscellaneous:

- the Senate provision designating the National Highway System was deleted due to the expectation that the conference on S.

(See other side)

YEAS (87)				NAYS (10)		NOT VOTING (2)	
Republican (52 or 100%)		Democrats (35 or 78%)		Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (10 or 22%)	Republicans (1)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Hutchison	Akaka	Kennedy		Biden	Hatfield- ^{2AY}	Bradley- ²
Ashcroft	Inhofe	Baucus	Kerry		Byrd		
Bennett	Jeffords	Bingaman	Kohl		Daschle		
Bond	Kassebaum	Boxer	Lautenberg		Dorgan		
Brown	Kempthorne	Breaux	Leahy		Ford		
Burns	Kyl	Bryan	Levin		Heflin		
Campbell	Lott	Bumpers	Lieberman		Johnston		
Chafee	Lugar	Conrad	Mikulski		Kerrey		
Coats	Mack	Dodd	Moseley-Braun		Reid		
Cochran	McCain	Exon	Moynihan		Rockefeller		
Cohen	McConnell	Feingold	Murray				
Coverdell	Murkowski	Feinstein	Nunn				
Craig	Nickles	Glenn	Pell				
D'Amato	Pressler	Graham	Pryor				
DeWine	Roth	Harkin	Robb				
Dole	Santorum	Hollings	Sarbanes				
Domenici	Shelby	Inouye	Simon				
Faircloth	Simpson		Wellstone				
Frist	Smith						
Gorton	Snowe						
Gramm	Specter						
Grams	Stevens						
Grassley	Thomas						
Gregg	Thompson						
Hatch	Thurmond						
Helms	Warner						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

440, the National Highway System bill, will soon be completed;

- certain procurement and personnel laws will be suspended for the Federal Aviation Administration as of April 1, 1996 (for related debate, see vote No. 381);
- it is the sense of the Senate that the action taken by the Government of Japan against United States air cargo and passenger carriers violates the United States/Japan bilateral aviation agreement; and
- funds will not be used to prepare, propose, or promulgate any regulations that prescribe changes in the corporate average fuel economy standards for light trucks.

Those favoring passage contended:

This conference report provides a balanced and fair distribution of limited funds to meet the operational needs of the Federal Aviation Administration, the Coast Guard, and the Federal Highway Administration. A highlight for Coast Guard funding is that \$300 million will be transferred from the Department of Defense to increase the Coast Guard's budget, bringing it to \$110 million more than the fiscal year 1995 level. For the Federal Aviation Administration, we are pleased to note that personnel and procurement reforms will be enacted effective April 1. For the Federal Highway Administration, this bill will provide almost \$20 billion for highway projects and slightly more than \$4 billion for mass transit projects. Also, we note that the provision on the designation of the National Highway System was deleted because we expect that S. 440, the National Highway System Designation Act, will soon be enacted. Overall this is a very fair, balanced, and frugal conference report that merits our strong endorsement.

While favoring passage, some Senators expressed the following reservations:

In past years the Transportation Appropriations bill has been riddled with earmarks and pork. This bill contains substantially fewer earmarks. Still, we have two concerns with the earmarks that it does contain. First, some of the earmarks for projects in this bill were originally made by the House with the stipulation that they were contingent on those projects first being authorized. That stipulation was dropped. Second, some of the earmarks that are in this bill are for projects that were not in either the House- or the Senate-passed bill. We have a third objection to this report as well. That objection, which is unrelated to earmarks, is that some of the accounts in this conference report are funded at levels that are higher than either House agreed to. Overall, though, this bill is a huge improvement over prior year Transportation Appropriations bills, and it therefore deserves our praise and support.

Those opposing final passage contended:

This conference report is patently unfair to rural States. In recent years, a false nostrum has gradually taken hold in the Senate that there is something inherently corrupt about earmarking funds for highway projects. Surprisingly, no such hostility has developed toward earmarks for urban mass transit projects. This bill, in fact, contains earmarks for 31 specific rail mass transit projects worth \$687 million and for 81 specific bus and bus-related projects worth \$333 million. Our objection is not to the earmarks for rail and bus projects--we favor them. Urban areas need investment in public transportation projects. Such investment stimulates development and leads to greater prosperity. Our objection is that rural areas, which have only highway transportation, never benefit from bus and rail earmarks. This selective hostility to highway transportation projects only is patently unfair. In protest, therefore, we urge our colleagues to vote against this conference report.